



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/499,207	02/07/2000	Jose Oriol Guixa Arderiu	2136/0G684	9917

7590 05/22/2002

Darby & Darby PC
805 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022

EXAMINER

IP, SIKYIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1742

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2002

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MF 12

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	Examiner	Group Art Unit

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/29/02 ; 2/25/02.

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 5 - 22 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 5 - 22 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 10

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Other _____

Office Action Summary

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. Claims 5-8 and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over JP 62047443 or JP 61133351.
4. The cited reference(s) disclose(s) the features including the claimed Cu-Pb alloy composition and casting and/or heating. The features relied upon described above can be found in the reference(s) at: their abstracts. The difference between the reference(s) and the claims are as follows: cited references do not disclose all claimed impurities. But, since the impurities elements are not elements added intentionally,

Serial No: 09/499,207

Art Unit: 1742

thus, the Cu alloys of cited references in the same art would have been inherently possessed such impurities. Moreover, difference in degree of purity itself does not predicate patentability. In re King, 43 USPQ 400 and In re Merz, 38 USPQ 143.

Changing form, purity, or other characteristic of an old product does not render the novel form patentable where the difference in form, purity or characteristic was inherent in or rendered obvious by the prior art. In re Cofer, 354 F2d 664, 148 USPQ 268 (CCPA 1966).

5. Claims 5-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over JP 10195562 or JP 09078162 in view of acknowledged prior art admission.

6. The cited reference(s) disclose(s) the features including the claimed Cu-Pb alloy composition and casting and/or heating. The features relied upon described above can be found in the reference(s) at: their abstracts. The difference between the reference(s) and the claims are as follows: cited references do not disclose all claimed impurities. But, since the impurities elements are not elements added intentionally, thus, the Cu alloys of cited references in the same art would have been inherently possessed such impurities.

7. Both cited references disclose heating after casting but does not disclose the claimed properties because of heating. But, the acknowledged prior art admission in page 2, second paragraph discloses that it is known heating at 550-650 °C for over an

hour would have the effect as claimed. Therefore, it is contemplated within ambit of skill artisan to recognize the cited Japanese references would also have the claimed properties after heat treatment.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed February 25, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
9. Applicants argue that the cited references do not disclose the claimed impurities. But, impurities are known not added intentional. Thus, the Cu alloys of cited references would also have claimed impurities.
10. Applicants' remarks in page 9, first paragraph of the instant remarks is noted. But, pre-heating before casting has not been claimed. Moreover, heating after casting has been disclosed by both JP 10195562 and JP 09078162 references.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The above rejection relies on the reference(s) for all the teachings expressed in the text(s) of the references and/or one of ordinary skill in the metallurgical art would have reasonably understood or implied from the text(s) of the reference(s). To emphasize certain

aspect(s) of the prior art, only specific portion(s) of the text(s) have been pointed out. Each reference as a whole should be reviewed in responding to the rejection, since other sections of the same reference and/or various combination of the cited references may be relied on in future rejection(s) in view of amendment(s).

All recited limitations in the instant claims have been met by the rejections as set forth above.

Applicant is reminded that when amendment and/or revision is required, applicant should therefore specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP § 2163.06 (a) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.119.

Examiner Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Ip whose telephone number is (703) 308-2542. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 5:30 A.M. to 2:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Roy V. King, can be reached on (703)-308-1146.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit 1742 are (703) 305-3601 (Official Paper only) and (703) 305-7719 (Unofficial Paper only). When filing a FAX in Technology Center 1700, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communication with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.



SIKYIN IP
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1742

S. Ip
May 20, 2002